

REMARKS

Claims 8 and 17 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 8 and 17 are dependent directly on independent claims 1 and 10 respectively. Claim 8, for example, specifically recites a plurality of second input fields whereas claim 1 from which it depends, has a second input field. The second input field is for use as a status indicator. Each of the plurality of second input fields in claim 8 is positioned adjacent a corresponding one of the plurality of first input fields. A script is run at the client to interpret an input from a first input field other than any of those which have a corresponding second input field adjacent. Obviously, in order to have such a first input field, there must be more first input fields than second input fields. In response to interpreting this input, the script alters the plurality of second input fields.

All of the above is clearly recited in claims 8 and 1 as originally filed. Claims 17 and 10, likewise make the same recitations. There is no indefiniteness. The examiner's interpretation is not accurate in that the plurality of first input fields are not altered, an input is interpreted from merely one first input field and there is no "event status" in the claim as recited. The script alters the plurality of second input fields.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

anticipated by the SafariBook. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection and offer the following arguments in support thereof. Referring to Figure 16.1 of the SafariBook, the Examiner states that the second input field for use as a status indicator of Applicant's claim 1, is the input field with an event handler to display event messages, presumably the large box with a title "Input Events(3)". This field, as shown in Figure 16.1 of the SafariBook, appears to be a text output field, and not an input field as required by Applicant's claim 1.

Furthermore, the text output field of Figure 16.1 appears to show a running record of various mouse clicks. It does not show that a script alters an input field to indicate a status of said one of said first input fields as required by Applicant's claim 1. Examples of altering the second input field are given in Applicant's Specification page 9, lines 7 - 13. Namely, altering an unselected radio button into a selected radio button or vice versa, altering a checkbox from unchecked to checked, or altering the text shown in an (input) textbox. The text in the (output) field of Figure 16.1 is not altered, but merely added to as additional mouse clicks are made.

Figure 16.1 of the SafariBook, therefore, does not describe or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's independent claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Likewise, independent claim 10 which recites means for performing these steps is also allowable.

All of the remaining claims are dependent directly or indirectly on claims 1 or 10 and are therefore also allowable.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance

and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 06/01/05

By: John Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607) 429-4358

Fax: (607) 429-4119